

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE THOTTATHIL B.RADHAKRISHNAN

FRIDAY, THE 26TH OCTOBER 2007 / 4TH KARTHIKA 1929

OP.No. 8398 of 2000(Y)

PETITIONER:

R.V.SUDHI, SENIOR CLERK,
PALLIPURAM SERVICE CO-OPERATIVE BANK LTD.,
NO.760, P.O., CHERAI- 683 514, EKM
DISTRICT (NOW UNDER ORDERS OF SUSPENSION)
RESIDING AT RAMADY HOUSE, NAYARAMBALAM P.O.,
EKM.

BY ADV. SRI.C.S.MANU

RESPONDENTS:

1. PALLIPPURAM SERVICE CO-OPERATIVE BANK LTD NO.760
P.O., CHERAI-683 514, EKM DISTRICT,
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY.
2. MANAGING COMMITTEE, PALLIPURAM SERVICE
CO-OPERATIVE SOCIETY LTD.NO.760
P.O., CHERAI-683 514, EKM DISTRICT,
REP. BY ITS PRESIDENT.
3. PRESIDENT, PALLIPURAM SERVICE CO-OPERATIVE
BANK LTD NO. 760,
P.O., CHERAI-683 514, EKM.
4. JOINT REGISTRAR OF CO-OPERATIVE SOCIETIES, EKM.

BY GOVERNMENT PLEADER PUSPALATHA M.K.

THIS ORIGINAL PETITION HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD
ON 26/10/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE
FOLLOWING:

APPENDIX

PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS

- EXT.P1- TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER NO.87/2000 DATED 11.3.2000
PASSED BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE BANK.
- EXT.P2- TRUE COPY OF THE COMPLAINT DATED 18.2.2000 SUBMITTED
BY THE 22 STAFF MEMBERS OF THE 1ST RESPONDENT BANK
TO THE 2ND RESPONDENT THROUGH THIRD RESPONDENT .
- EXT.P3- TRUE COPY OF THE MEMO DATED 8.3.00 ISSUED BY THIRD
RESPONDENT PRESIDENT TO THE PETITIONER
- EXT.P4- TRUE COPY OF the REPLY DATED 10.3.00 SUBMITTED BY THE
PETITIONER TO THE THIRD RESPONDENT
- EXT.P5- TRUE COPY OF THE PETITION DATED 13.3.00 SUBMITTED BY
THE PETITIONER BEFORE THE FOURTH RESPONDENT

(TRUE COPY)

P.A TO JUDGE

THOTTATHIL B. RADHAKRISHNAN, J

O.P. 8398/2000

Dated this the 26th day of October, 2007

JUDGMENT

In view of the fact that the first respondent has received notice, notices to the second and third respondents are dispensed with and the matter is treated as right.

2. Petitioner challenges Ext.P1 order of suspension issued on 11.3.2000. This Court had not issued any orders staying the order of suspension, though relief was sought for in C.M.P. 14001/2000. Order of suspension is obviously a matter to be considered by the Registrar of Soceties. I do not, therefore, find any reason to interfere with Ext.P1 at this distance of time.

This petition is, therefore, dismissed without prejudice to other contentions.

THOTTATHIL B. RADHAKRISHNAN
Judge

mrCS